

JOINTLY SUBMITTED

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

William Bridge, *on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,*

Case No.: 2:14-cv-01512-LDG-NJK

Plaintiff,
vs.

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO
MOTION TO STAY ACTION PURSUANT
TO PRIMARY JURISDICTION
DOCTRINE**

Credit One Financial, a Nevada Corporation
d/b/a Credit One Bank, N.A.,

Defendant

(Second Request)

The parties to the above-captioned action hereby jointly submit for the Court's approval the following Stipulation and Proposed Order:

WHEREAS, on February 2, 2015, Defendant CREDIT ONE FINANCIAL d/b/a CREDIT ONE BANK, N.A. (“Defendant”) filed a Motion to Stay Action Pursuant to the Primary Jurisdiction Doctrine Pending Outcome of Petitions Currently Before the Federal Communications Commission (“Motion”) (Dkt. No. 27);

WHEREAS, Plaintiff WILLIAM BRIDGE (“Plaintiff”) has previously requested, on February 13, 2015, by stipulation with Defendant (Dkt. No. 34), a one-week extension of time in which to respond to the Motion, which was denied without prejudice on February 17, 2015 (Dkt. No. 36), and has received no extension of such time as of the date of this filing;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requires additional time to respond to Defendant's Motion because (a) Plaintiff is currently investigating and confirming facts believed by Plaintiff to bear materially on Defendant's arguments in support of the Motion, which investigation and confirmation is not expected to be completed prior to February 20, 2015; (b) Plaintiff is still reviewing and analyzing the numerous petitions pending before the Federal Communications Commission filed by Defendant in support of the Motion, and does not expect such review and analysis to be completed prior to February 20, 2015; and (c) Plaintiff requires at least two business days to draft the results of

1 Plaintiff's factual investigation described in sub-paragraph (a), above, and the results of Plaintiff's
2 legal analysis described in sub-paragraph (b), above, making February 24, 2015, a reasonable and
3 appropriate deadline for responding to the Motion;

4 WHEREAS, under the present schedule, Plaintiff's response to the Motion is due on
5 February 17, 2015;

6 WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Defendant have conferred and agreed that the time for Plaintiff's
7 response to the Motion should be extended by a period of seven (7) days;

8 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties, by and through their respective undersigned counsel, and
9 subject to this Court's approval, agree and stipulate that Plaintiff may file a response to the Motion
10 no later than February 24, 2015.

11 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**

12 SHOOK & STONE, CHTD.

GRANT & EISENHOFER P.A.

13 /s/ Leonard H. Stone
14 LEONARD H. STONE (NV Bar No. 5791)
MICHAEL P. O'ROURKE (NV Bar No.
6764)
7109 S. Fourth Street
16 Las Vegas, NV 89101
17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

/s/ Adam J. Levitt
ADAM J. LEVITT (admitted pro hac vice)
KYLE J. McGEE (admitted pro hac vice)
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1200
Chicago, IL 60602
Attorneys for Plaintiff

18
19 HOLLAND & HART LLP

20 /s/ Brian G. Anderson
21 PATRICK J. REILLY (NV Bar No. 6103)
BRIAN G. ANDERSON (NV Bar No. 10500)
22 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134
23 *Attorneys for Defendant*

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

25
26 NANCY J. KOPPE
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28 DATED: _____